

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of the Claims:

Claims 1-39 remain pending. By way of the present reply, Applicants have amended claims 2-10, 16 and 17 are currently being amended. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Objection to the Specification:

The specification was objected because of informalities. The specification has been amended to include the phrase that an acronym represents before the acronym the first instance that the acronym is used for the following acronyms: IP, RTP, QoS and UDP. This provides a written description of the invention or discovery and of the manner and process of making and using the same, and is required to be in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which the invention or discovery appertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same. 37 CFR § 1.71(a). Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Objections:

Claims 2, 3, 16 and 17 were objected to for informalities. Claims 2, 3, 16 and 17 have been amended to Real Time Packets in the first instance. Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 2, 3, 16 and 17 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 4, 5, 7-10, 14, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 4 and 5

Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to recite “packet data” with antecedent basis from independent claim 1. Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 7

Claims 6 and 7 been amended to recite “the file data sent out from the transmission side” with antecedent basis from dependent claim 4. Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9 and 10

Claims 8, 9 and 10 have been amended to recite “voice data” with antecedent basis from independent claim 1. Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 38 and 39

The “system” in line 2 of each of dependent claims 14, 38 and 39, as currently pending, referred to is the system recited in independent claims 1, 2 and 3, respectively. It is the same system recited in line 1 of dependent claims 14, 38 and 39, respectively. Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Koyama et al. (US 6,226,361 B1)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-19, 26-27, 30-35, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama et al. (US 6,226,361 B1).

Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 12 and 15

Independent claim 1 recites, “voice clauses are divided and transmitted as packet data in divided clause units.” Koyama points out that the voice data is converted into a character code data signal using speech recognition (see column 5, lines 24-26). Koyama further discloses that a packet and communication control section 5a partitions the character code

data signal for each suitable length to form packets (see column 5, lines 41-43). However, Koyama does not describe that the character code data signal is divided into clause units as claimed in independent claim 1. Koyama does not disclose any correspondence between the suitable length into which the character code data signal is partitioned and clause units. Thus, Koyama does not teach that voice clauses are divided and transmitted as packet data in divided clause units, as claimed in independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 additionally recites, “the voice data is output as voice based on the received packet data in clause units.” Koyama discloses that received packet data are demodulated into a character code data signal by speech synthesis by a packet reception and communication control section 5b (see column 5, lines 47-49). Koyama is silent as to whether the received packet data is in clause units as claimed in independent claim 1. Therefore, Koyama does not teach that the voice data is output as voice based on the received packet data in clause units, as claimed in independent claim 1.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131 (quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). Additionally, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Id. (quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Because Koyama does not disclose the two limitations as discussed above in the detail contained in the claim, this does not anticipate independent claim 1. Because independent claim 15 recites similar limitations, Koyama does not anticipate this claim.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama of dependent claims 4, 8, 10 and 12 from their dependence on independent claim 1.

Claims 3, 17, 19, 27, 31, 33, 35 and 39

Independent claim 3 recites “the input voice data is divided off into clause units.” The Office Action in Item 6 indicates that Koyama discloses that the input voice is recognized first and then converted into data in form of a packet (see column 1, lines 57-59). But, Koyama is silent as to whether the input voice data is divided off into clause units. Therefore, Koyama does not teach that the input voice data is divided off into clause units, as recited in independent claim 3.

Independent claim 3 additionally has been amended to recite “a plurality of voice data Real Time Packets (RTPs) in the clause units are combined into a single packet data and transferred to a communication path.” The Office Action in Item 6 points out that Koyama discloses the system involves a communication in the single packet exchange network (see column 1, lines 62-63). However, there is no discussion in Koyama Real Time Packets (RTPs) in the clause units, as recited in independent claim 3. Thus, Koyama does not disclose this limitation of independent claim 3.

In view of these absent limitations in Koyama, Applicants contend that Koyama does not anticipate independent claim 3. Because independent claim 17 recites similar limitations, Koyama does not anticipate this claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 3 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections of dependent claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama from their dependence on independent claim 3.

Claims 26, 30, 32 and 35

Dependent claims 26, 30, 32 and 35 depends on independent claim 2. Because the Office Action states no rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama of dependent claims 26, 30, 32 and 35 be withdrawn from their dependence on independent claim 2.

Tsutsumi et al. (US 2003/0179745 A1)

Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 16, 20-25, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsutsumi et al. (US 2003/0179745 A1).

Claims 2, 16, 20, 22, 24 and 28

Independent claim 2 recites “the input voice data is divided into clause units.” The Office Action in Item 6 indicates that Tsutsumi discloses a packet switching circuit 142 for generating a voice packet (see [0024], lines 6-7). However, Tsutsumi does not discuss that the input voice data is divided into clause units as claimed in independent claim 2. Thus, Tsutsumi does not teach that the input voice data is divided into clause units, as claimed in independent claim 2.

Additionally, independent claim 2 has been amended to recite “a plurality of voice data Real Time Packets (RTPs) in the clause units are transferred as packet data to a communication path.” According to Item 6 of the Office Action, Tsutsumi discloses that voice data accumulated is transmitted from start till end to the packet switching circuit 142 and converted to IP packet (see [0032], lines 3-6). But, Tsutsumi is silent as to whether the Real Time Packets are in clause units. Therefore, Tsutsumi does not teach that a plurality of voice data Real Time Packets (RTPs) in the clause units are transferred as packet data to a communication path, as claimed in independent claim 2.

Because Tsutsumi does not disclose the two limitations as discussed above in the detail contained in the claim, this does not anticipate independent claim 2. Because independent claim 16 recites similar limitations, Tsutsumi does not anticipate this claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 2 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsutsumi be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsutsumi of dependent claims 20, 22, 24 and 28 from their dependence on independent claim 2.

Claims 5-7, 9, 21, 23, 25 and 29

Dependent claims 5-7, 9; and 21, 23, 25 and 29 depends on independent claims 1 and 3, respectively. Because the Office Action states no rejection of either of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsutsumi, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsutsumi of dependent claims 5-7, 9; and 21, 23, 25 and 29 be withdrawn from their dependence on independent claims 1 and 3, respectively.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 10, 11, 13, 30-33, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Williamson et al. (US 4,093,821).

Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14; and 31, 33 and 37

Dependent claims 10, 11, 13 and 14; and 31, 33 and 37 depend from independent claims 1 and 3, respectively. The Office Action does not indicate what the Applicants' admitted prior art teaches. Williamson does not disclose the limitations of independent claims 1 and 3 discussed above missing from Koyama. Thus, dependent claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 are not rendered unpatentable over Koyama in view of Applicants' admitted prior art and Williamson. Accordingly applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 10, 11, 13 and 14; and 31, 33 and 37.

Claims 30, 32 and 36

Dependent claims 30, 32 and 36 depend from independent claim 2. The Office Action does not indicate what the Applicants' admitted prior art teaches. Williamson does not disclose the limitations of independent claim 2 discussed above missing from Tsutsumi. Thus, dependent claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 are not rendered unpatentable over Koyama in view of Applicants' admitted prior art and Williamson. Accordingly applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claims 30, 32 and 36.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 19, 2007 By Justin T. Darrow

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

Justin T. Darrow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,807